

IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
FOR THE WESTERN DISTRICT OF WISCONSIN

RONNIE FAMOUS,

Plaintiff,

v.

ORDER

DOE ZOHIA, *et al.*

12-cv-144-wmc

Defendants.

Plaintiff Ronnie Famous has been granted leave to proceed against a group of state defendants, many of them “Does,” on his Eighth Amendment claim that for the defendants have been deliberately indifferent to Famous’s long-lasting eye infections. Famous asked for appointment of counsel to represent him in this lawsuit and the court initially denied this request. It now appears from more recent filings (*see* dkts. 27-30 & 37) and this court’s short telephonic conference with Famous on August 1, 2012, that appointment of counsel for trial is necessary in this case. Accordingly, we will stay all proceedings in this case until the court locates a lawyer who is willing to represent Famous. This might take a while—as in several months—so Famous should be patient.

A lawyer accepting appointment in a case like this one takes the case with no guarantee of compensation for his or her work. Famous should be aware that in any case in which a party is represented by a lawyer, the court communicates only with the lawyer. Thus, once counsel is appointed, the court no longer will communicate with Famous directly about this case. Famous will have to communicate directly with his lawyer about any concerns and allow the lawyer to exercise his or her professional judgment to determine which matters to bring to the court’s attention and what motions and other documents are appropriate to file. Famous will not have the right to require counsel to raise frivolous arguments or to follow every directive he

makes. He should be prepared to accept his lawyer's strategic decisions even if he disagrees with some of them, and he should understand that it is unlikely that this court will appoint another lawyer to represent him if Famous chooses not to cooperate with the lawyer the court appoints now.

ORDER

It is ORDERED that plaintiff Ronnie Famous's request for appointment of counsel, dkt. 79, is GRANTED. Further proceedings in this case remain STAYED pending appointment of counsel for plaintiff. Once the court finds counsel willing to represent plaintiff, the court will advise the parties and hold a status and scheduling conference.

Entered this 3rd day of August, 2012.

BY THE COURT:

/s/

STEPHEN L. CROCKER
Magistrate Judge